EXHIBIT 3

```
Page 1
 1
               UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     E. Jean Carroll,
 4
                 Plaintiff,
 5
                                        Case No.
 6
          vs.
                                        1:22-CV-10016-LAK
 7
     Donald J. Trump,
                 Defendant.
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
          VIDEO DEPOSITION OF ROBERT J. FISHER
                Via Zoom Videoconference
15
16
                 Monday, February 6, 2023
17
18
19
20
21
      Reported by:
      LISA MOSKOWITZ, CA CSR 10816, RPR, CRR, CLR,
22
      Washington CSR 21001437, Nevada CCR 991,
23
      NCRA Realtime Systems Administrator
24
25
      JOB NO. 222071
```

- In Carroll II, as you're talking
- 2 about, I was asked to do just an expert
- 3 report, and it had nothing to do with
- 4 rebuttal reports but do an expert report in
- 5 that case.
- Q. And by you were asked, you were
- 7 asked by defendant's counsel; is that
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 10 Q. Mr. Fisher who's on the line
- 11 today -- I'm sorry. Mr. Swift.
- 12 A. Mr. Swift, yes. He can claim my
- 13 name. That's fine.
- Q. So is it your testimony that your
- 15 report in Carroll II which was dated
- 16 January 30, 2023, was not a rebuttal report?
- 17 A. No, not at all. No. In Carroll I,
- 18 I was specifically retained to do -- as a
- 19 rebuttal expert, and my main task was to do
- 20 a rebuttal report, and we had two
- 21 subsequent -- or one deposition over two
- 22 periods.
- In rebuttal II after the
- 24 plaintiff -- I'm sorry. In Carroll II when
- 25 the plaintiff refiled, they asked me to do

- 1 an expert report which had nothing to do
- 2 with rebutting anything. It was just
- 3 strictly to do a report on -- as an expert
- 4 in that case.
- 5 So the first one was a rebuttal
- 6 report. The second one was a plain expert
- 7 report.
- Q. Okay.
- 9 So your position is that your
- 10 report in Carroll II is not a response to or
- 11 rebuttal of Professor Humphreys' report in
- 12 Carroll II?
- 13 A. No. In fact, I didn't even read --
- 14 Professor Humphrey did two reports. She did
- 15 a rebuttal report -- or she did a report on
- 16 the June 21, June 22, and June 24 statements
- 17 of Mr. Trump. I wrote -- and then she filed
- 18 a report on that. I wrote a rebuttal report
- 19 on that.
- Subsequently Mr. Trump made other
- 21 statements on October 12, 2022, of which
- 22 case subsequent to that, the plaintiff filed
- 23 a second lawsuit which included battery I
- think, as well as defamation. I was asked
- 25 after that to do a full expert report based

- 1 on her, you know, her new complaint
- 2 addressing defamation. None of it has to do
- 3 anything -- Professor Humphreys subsequently
- 4 did a second report based on the October 12
- 5 statement. I was not asked to do a rebuttal
- 6 report on her second report and, as a matter
- 7 of fact, I didn't even read it. I skimmed
- 8 it, but I'm not here to talk about her
- 9 second report.
- 10 Q. Understood.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. And so I'm going to -- we'll mark
- 13 this as Fisher 1.
- 14 (Exhibit Number 1 was marked
- for identification.)
- 16 BY ATTORNEY CRAIG:
- 17 Q. The court reporter just handed you
- 18 a document marked as Exhibit 1. Is this the
- 19 report you prepared in Carroll II and issued
- 20 on January 30, 2023?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. How many hours did it take
- 23 you to draft this report?
- 24 A. I don't know exactly, but I'm going
- 25 to guess probably around 12, 15 hours.

- 1 give context and perspective when I guess
- 2 it's not needed sometimes.
- 3 Q. Have you developed any new methods
- 4 or methodologies or techniques as part of
- 5 your work since your Carroll I deposition?
- A. No, because those methodologies are
- 7 rock solid. There's no reason to reinvent
- 8 the wheel when they are accepted
- 9 methodologies, and they're effective
- 10 methodologies.
- 11 Q. And would you say your methodology
- in Carroll II is similar to your methodology
- in Carroll I?
- 14 A. I would say so, yes.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 And if we can look at your report
- 17 which is Exhibit 1 which you still have in
- 18 front of you, I just had a -- on page 2 --
- 19 A. Oh, they're back and back. That's
- 20 unusual. Okay. I went from 1 to 3, and I
- 21 thought a page was missing. Yes, go ahead.
- Q. Do you see there's a section in the
- 23 middle of the page with the title Media
- 24 Expert/Analysis?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 it's relevant to the case, yes, I do list
- 2 it.
- 3 But usually that only comes in the
- 4 form of media articles for the most part.
- 5 Q. And those relevant media articles
- 6 in this case are the six that we are talking
- 7 about before?
- 8 A. Yeah. One other thing too is if I
- 9 come across a legal document on the internet
- 10 which they haven't provided me, then I would
- 11 put that down as well. I would record that
- 12 because that's -- that's specifically
- 13 related to the case as opposed to the
- 14 background and what products this company
- 15 makes.
- Q. Were there any legal documents in
- 17 this case that you found through your
- 18 internet research that you didn't -- that
- 19 you listed here?
- 20 A. No, there were none in this case
- 21 that I -- sometimes I come across, not often
- 22 but not in this case, no.
- Q. Approximately how long did you
- 24 spend on your internet research in
- 25 connection with your Carroll II report?

- 1 A. I would say at most an hour,
- 2 maybe -- I'd say a half hour to an hour and
- a half is generally for most cases, you
- 4 know, I just do a cursory look at -- you
- 5 know, I Google whatever it is, and then I
- 6 look down, scroll down and look and see if
- 7 there's anything.
- 8 So I would say 45 minutes to an
- 9 hour and a quarter would be average.
- 10 Q. Average in all your cases?
- 11 A. Yeah, in most cases.
- 12 Q. In this case 30 to 60 minutes?
- 13 A. Yeah, unless something like the one
- 14 case I had which I won't mention the name
- of, there were like 2- or 300 media articles
- on; so I probably spent three or four hours
- 17 on that. But that's a rare case.
- 18 Q. Are there any parts of your report
- 19 that are based on the internet research that
- 20 you did in connection with this case?
- 21 A. I would say -- I would say no
- 22 except maybe -- no, I mean, the legal
- 23 documents, complaints gave me information.
- 24 Deposition. I got a lot of good information
- 25 off the depositions. And the expert report.

- 1 that you've had in your professional
- 2 communications and expert witness
- 3 backgrounds. Are there specific previous
- 4 applicable experiences you drew upon in
- 5 preparing this Carroll II report?
- 6 A. I think I mean that in a general
- 7 sense as opposed to individual cases. No, I
- 8 can't say that there was a specific case or
- 9 more than one case. It's more or less the
- 10 broad overview of circumstances that
- 11 happened in such cases of this type.
- 12 Q. And did you review any files from
- 13 prior cases in connection with your Carroll
- 14 II report?
- 15 A. No, not in writing this report, no.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- 17 And you also write in your report
- 18 that you don't rely on, quote, surveys,
- 19 studies, tests, research, or other forms of
- 20 qualitative types of analyses, facts
- 21 gathering procedures. Is that sort of a
- 22 fair reflection of the type of materials you
- 23 didn't consider in connection with your --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- Carroll II report?

- 1 give me any direction as to what to do. He
- 2 said -- she did another report based on the
- 3 October 12 thing.
- I mean, he didn't ask me to read it
- 5 in total. He didn't ask me to comment on it
- 6 or anything. He just said -- I assume he
- 7 just thought it would be good for me for
- 8 background.
- 9 Q. Are there any parts of Professor
- 10 Humphreys' Carroll II report that you sought
- 11 to rebut in connection with your Carroll II
- 12 report?
- 13 A. No, not at all. But I did -- I do
- 14 have a section in this report, which I'm
- 15 sure you're aware of, that does discuss
- 16 Ms. Carroll's expert, but most of that is
- information derived from the first report,
- is basically on her views and opinions.
- I did put one paragraph into this
- 20 report. The only thing I picked out of that
- 21 report in skimming it was a statistic that
- 22 she had related to the number of people that
- 23 might be influenced by Mr. Trump's comments.
- 24 And that's near the end of the report.
- You know, I just made a reference

- 1 there was an interesting point she made in
- 2 the report that I thought was worth adding
- 3 into this report.
- 4 Q. Understood.
- 5 And is there any other part of your
- 6 report that addresses Professor Humphreys'
- 7 Carroll II report besides this paragraph?
- 8 A. Yes. I mention earlier in the
- 9 section on -- that I first addressed the
- 10 reputation expert. The plaintiff's expert,
- 11 page 21. I do note that she did do a second
- 12 report.
- Q. On page 21 do you report or respond
- 14 to that in any way?
- 15 A. No, in fact, it's on page 22 a
- 16 third of the way down under assignments.
- 17 Humphreys was retained by plaintiff legal
- 18 counsel twice to prepare expert witness
- 19 reports. The first was to cover the alleged
- 20 false statements made by defendant on
- 21 June 21, 2022, and 24, 2019.
- The second report covered his
- October 12, 2022, statement. That's the
- 24 only other time in the report that I
- 25 referenced the second report that she did.

The six newspaper articles we

Page 148

1 Certified Stenographer.)

BY ATTORNEY CRAIG:

Ο.

- 4 talked about before, is there anything
- 5 besides those newspaper articles?
- A. Well, reading her biography, her
- 7 profile.

3

- 8 Q. Where did you see her biography?
- 9 A. Well, I went online and saw
- 10 information about her. I told you I Googled
- 11 her. A gal like that, she had a couple of
- 12 pages of content about her on there, and I
- 13 looked at some of it for background. As I
- 14 said, I looked to see who she was, and I saw
- 15 nothing negative whatsoever about her, not
- 16 unrelated to the Trump case, but I saw
- 17 nothing in her background that was negative.
- 18 It appears she was a total professional and
- 19 viewed that way.
- 20 Q. So besides the articles you
- 21 mentioned before and the Googling you did,
- 22 anything else that you considered?
- 23 A. Yeah, these -- I have it in my
- 24 report here. These articles. I quote some
- of the articles on the Trump case, the six

- 1 that I listed there. I quoted some of them
- 2 in my report and talked about the highly
- 3 laudatory comments that were made in those
- 4 articles about her after the fact. After
- 5 the suit.
- 6 Q. Is your entire understanding of
- 7 Ms. Carroll's reputation based on the
- 8 comments in those six articles?
- 9 A. Well, we already talked about
- 10 online I saw --
- 11 Q. So the six articles and the
- 12 Googling you did?
- 13 A. Yeah, the Googling for the most
- 14 part, yeah, and also in the complaint. The
- 15 complaint, the original complaint and the
- other complaint talked about her image, her
- 17 reputation, talked about her
- 18 accomplishments.
- I mean, it's all over the place. I
- 20 don't deny the woman -- I never heard of her
- 21 before the Trump case. I mean, I live in
- 22 L.A. She's in New York. I don't read Elle
- 23 magazine. So I didn't know who she was from
- 24 these two people when I walked in this room.
- The point is I did do research on

- 1 study? No. From looking online and looking
- 2 at the first ten pages of her Google
- 3 presence, it was clear that there was a
- 4 tremendous increase in articles about her or
- 5 exposure than there was prior to that.
- 6 Q. By looking -- by your reference to
- 7 looking at the first ten pages of Google,
- 8 you just mean the nature of the search
- 9 results that you would see if you put in
- 10 E. Jean Carroll's name in Google?
- 11 A. Yeah, in other words, you know,
- 12 each page has 10 to 12 things on it and you
- 13 go through pages 2, 3, 4, 5.
- 14 You know, I saw other references to
- 15 Ms. Carroll but not nearly the weight of the
- 16 exposure she received after she came forward
- 17 to accuse Mr. Trump of rape.
- 18 Q. You referred in your earlier answer
- 19 to you did an analysis in this report which
- is in the next section on page 20, and those
- 21 articles are highly favorable toward
- 22 Ms. Carroll. Are you referring just to the
- 23 three articles you talk about on page 20 and
- 24 carrying over to page 21?
- 25 A. Yeah, in other words, on page 20

Page 206 1 record. (Recess taken from 2:59 p.m. to 3:08 p.m.) 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 4 5 3:08 p.m., and we're back on the video 6 record. BY ATTORNEY CRAIG: 7 So, Mr. Fisher, if you want to turn 8 Ο. to page 22 of your report at Exhibit 1, you 9 see there's a section that has the header, 10 Reputation Repair Program? 11 Α. 12 Yes. 13 Q. And you note in here that at the bottom of -- sorry. Right above that 14 section you say: While I attribute the 15 following mostly to her first report, the 16 content from my brief review from her second 17 18 report was the same in both her reports. 19 And then you go on to the section entitled Reputation Repair Program. 20 Do you see that? 21 Uh-huh. 22 Α. Is it accurate to say that the text 23 Q. of this with the exception of that one 24 25 paragraph on page 24 draws from your first

0400 1.22 07 10010 E/ IIV B 00411011 07 0 7 1104 00/10/20 7 4g0 10 07 17

- 1 report?
- 2 A. Yes, yes.
- Q. And so this is written,
- 4 specifically concerns the reputation repair
- 5 program that Professor Humphreys developed
- 6 in her Carroll I report?
- 7 A. Yeah. Most of this text was in my
- 8 rebuttal report. It's just since I was
- 9 doing an overview of the entire case, I
- 10 thought I should have a section in here
- 11 about her report. But most of this is old
- 12 ground covered in our first two depositions.
- Q. And, in fact, the citations in this
- 14 section are to pages in Professor Humphreys'
- 15 first report --
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 Q. -- from Carroll I?
- 18 A. Correct. 100 percent, yes.
- 19 Q. Is there anything different sort of
- in substance between what's in this report
- 21 and then what's in your prior Carroll I
- 22 report?
- A. No, I don't believe so. I think
- 24 that -- I mean, obviously this is only an
- 25 excerpt from my first report because my

- 1 first report was, what, 10, 12 pages. I
- 2 just put out -- basically from the first
- 3 report I just pulled out sort of the gist
- 4 of, you know, the important points from that
- 5 first report. I added in a paragraph just
- 6 referencing the second report which you saw.
- 7 And so there's no real new ground
- 8 break in that. It's just I thought if I was
- 9 doing a comprehensive report on the whole
- 10 case, I would have had to add in, you know,
- 11 something related to their expert.
- 12 Q. Were there any additional materials
- 13 that we didn't cover --
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. -- in your last deposition --
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Let me just get the question out.
- 18 Are there any materials that
- 19 weren't addressed or covered in your last
- 20 deposition that you considered before
- 21 including this section in your Carroll II
- 22 report?
- A. No, no. As I said, what I was
- 24 trying to do was just to kind of summarize
- 25 the main points I had in the -- relating to